

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 \* \* \*

7 FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY,  
8 Plaintiff(s),  
9 v.  
10 SATICOY BAY, LLC,  
11 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-CV-913 JCM (GWF)

ORDER

12  
13 Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Foley's report and recommendation  
14 ("R&R"). (ECF No. 30). No objections have been filed, and the deadline for filing objections has  
15 since passed.

16 On March 31, 2017, petitioner Federal Housing Finance Agency filed a request for a  
17 subpoena seeking information and documents related to every property that respondent Saticoy  
18 Bay, LLC ("Saticoy") and its affiliates held or claimed an interest in as the result of a HOA  
19 foreclosure sale pursuant to NRS § 116.3116 conducted on or after September 18, 2009. (ECF  
20 No. 1-2).

21 On June 14, 2017, petitioner filed a cross-motion for an order requiring respondent to  
22 comply with the subpoena. (ECF No. 18). Respondent filed an opposition (ECF No. 24), and  
23 petitioner filed a reply. (ECF No. 26). On June 15, respondent filed a motion to quash petitioner's  
24 motion to enforce the subpoena. (ECF No. 19). petitioner filed an opposition (ECF No. 17), and  
25 respondent filed a reply. (ECF No. 25). On July 21, 2017, Magistrate Judge Foley held a hearing  
26 on the motions. (ECF No. 28). On August 10, 2017, Magistrate Judge Foley issued the instant  
27 report and recommendation. (ECF No. 30).  
28

1           This court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or  
2 recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects  
3 to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, then the court is required to “make a de novo  
4 determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made.”  
5 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

6           Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct “any review at  
7 all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149  
8 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a  
9 magistrate judge’s report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See United*  
10 *States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review  
11 employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no  
12 objections were made).

13           Upon review of the order and the underlying briefs, the court finds that good cause appears  
14 to adopt the magistrate judge’s findings in their entirety.

15           Accordingly,

16           IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Magistrate Judge  
17 Foley’s report and recommendation (ECF No. 30) be, and the same hereby is, ADOPTED in its  
18 entirety.

19           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner’s cross-motion for an order requiring  
20 respondent to comply with the subpoena (ECF No. 18) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED in  
21 part and DENIED in part, and that respondent’s motion to quash (ECF No. 19) be, and the same  
22 hereby is, GRANTED in part and DENIED in part, consistent with the following:

- 23           1. Respondent Saticoy shall provide petitioner FHFA with the Assessor’s Parcel  
24 Number (APN), legal description, and street address (including unit number, if  
25 any, and city, state, and zip code) of each property that respondent and  
26 respondent’s affiliates have held or claimed an interest in and that was the  
27 subject of an HOA foreclosure completed under Nevada Revised Statute §  
28 116.3116 between September 18, 2009 and the present.

...

...

1 2. Respondent shall not be required at this time to provide petitioner with any other  
2 information requested in the subpoena.

3 DATED August 31, 2017.

4   
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE